

REMARKS

This Application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office Action mailed May 11, 2004 ("Office Action"). At the time of the Office Action, Claims 1-30 were pending in the application. In the Office Action, the Examiner rejects Claims 1-30. Applicants cancel Claims 1-30 and add new Claims 31-63. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and favorable action in this case.

References Cited by Examiner

The Examiner has supplied to Applicants a Notice of References Cited. U.S. Patent No. 6,182,141, dated January 30, 2001, issued to Blum et al. was supplied to Applicants, but not listed in the Notice of References Cited.

Amendments to the Specification

Applicants have amended the paragraph beginning "This application is related to . . . " on Page 1, line 3 of the present Application to include the serial number (09/726,766) of the identified copending application.

Copending Application 09/726 currently stands rejected. Although Applicants believe that Examiner has access to the file of copending Application 09/726,766, Examiner may call the undersigned attorney for Applicants should Examiner have any questions about copending Application 09/726,766.

Section 112 Rejections

The Examiner rejects Claims 1, 11, 20, and 30 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicants regard as the invention. Applicants have canceled Claims 1-30 and added new Claims 31-63. Applicants believe that new Claims 31-63 are in accordance with § 112, second paragraph. For at least these reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that the § 112, second paragraph rejections no longer apply to Applicants' claims

Section 102 and 103 Rejections

The Examiner rejects Claims 1, 4-9, 13-18, 21, 24-27, and 30 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipate by U.S. Patent No. 6,614,809 issued Verma et al. ("*Verma*"). The Examiner rejects Claims 2-3, 10-12, 19-20, 22-23, and 28-29 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable with *Verma* in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,697,360 issued to Gai et al. ("*Gai*"). Applicants have canceled Claims 1-30 and added new Claims 31-63. As discussed below, Applicants believe new Claims 31-63 are allowable over the cited references. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that the Examiner's § 102 and 103 rejections no longer apply to Applicants' claims..

New Claims 31- 63 are Allowable

New Claims 31-63 have been added and are fully supported by the original specification. No new matter has been added. Because neither *Verna* nor *Gai* disclose, teach, or suggest each and every feature recited in Applicants' claims, Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 31-63 are allowable over the cited references. As just one example, Claim 31 recites "at a first client, forming a first encapsulated point-to-point protocol data unit by appending a network address request header to a point-to-point protocol data unit, wherein the point-to-point protocol data unit comprises a header including an identifier associated with a second client and a payload comprising information to be communicated to the second client."

This combination of features is not disclosed, taught, or suggested in the prior art of record. *Verna* discloses a "system and method for establishing tunnel connections across multiple networks of differing types." (Abstract). Specifically, *Verna* discloses a system and method for establishing a tunneling session between a tunnel initiator 30 and a tunnel endpoint 150 through the use of a tunnel media translator 240. (Figure 6). The portion of *Verna* relied on by the Examiner merely describes the steps taken by tunnel translator 240 to perform address translation to enable tunneling between two endpoints on different networks. (Column 7, line 1 through Column 8, line 4). Only after tunnel translator creates a dynamic table that defines both ends of tunnel connection 202, can a "call session [be] established for the call originated by remote client 20." (Column 7, lines 62-65; Column 8, lines 31-32).

Accordingly, although *Verna* discloses that the “call session corresponds to a single PPP stream between the tunnel initiator 30 and the tunnel endpoint 150,” the system and method disclosed in *Verna* is limited to the establishment of a tunnel between the tunnel initiator 30 and the tunnel endpoint 150. *Verna* does not disclose, teach, or suggest “at a first client, forming a first encapsulated point-to-point protocol data unit by appending a network address request header to a point-to-point protocol data unit, wherein the point-to-point protocol data unit comprises a header including an identifier associated with a second client and a payload comprising information to be communicated to the second client,” as recited in new Claim 31.

For similar reasons, Applicants believe independent Claims 36, 49, 58, and 67 are allowable over *Verna*. For example, *Verna* does not disclose, teach, or suggest “at a tunneling server, receiving from a first client an encapsulated point-to-point protocol data unit comprising a first header that includes an identifier associated with a second client, a payload comprising information to be communicated to the second client, and a network address request header appended to the first header,” as recited in new independent Claim 36. *Verna* also does not disclose, teach, or suggest “at a tunneling server, receiving from a first client an encapsulated point-to-point protocol data unit comprising a first header that includes an identifier associated with a second client, a payload comprising information to be communicated to the second client, and a network address request header appended to the first header,” as recited in new independent Claim 49. *Verna* also does not disclose, teach, or suggest “a tunneling module operable to receive a first point-to-point protocol data unit encapsulated within a network address request header,” as recited in new independent Claim 58. *Verna* also does not disclose, teach, or suggest “a first client comprising . . . a tunneling module operable to encapsulate the first point-to-point data unit within a network address request header to form a first encapsulated signal,” as recited in new independent Claim 67.

For at least these reasons, Applicants respectfully request consideration and allowance of new Claims 31-63.

CONCLUSION

Applicants have made an earnest attempt to place this case in condition for immediate allowance. For the foregoing reasons and for other reasons clear and apparent, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of the pending claims.

If the Examiner feels that a telephone conference or an interview would advance prosecution of this Application in any manner, the undersigned attorney for Applicants stands ready to conduct such a conference at the convenience of the Examiner.

Applicants enclose a check in the amount of \$212.00 to cover the cost of additional claims. However, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees or credit any overpayments to Deposit Account No. 02-0384 of Baker Botts L.L.P.

Respectfully submitted,

BAKER BOTTS L.L.P.
Attorneys for Applicants



Douglas M. Kubehl
Reg. No. 41,915

Date: July 2, 2004

CORRESPONDENCE ADDRESS:

2001 Ross Avenue, Suite 600
Dallas, Texas 75201-2980
Phone: (214) 953-6486

Customer No. 05073